

Appl. No.: 09/693,060
Amdt. dated 08/25/2006
Reply to Office action of 05/26/2006

REMARKS

This response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated May 26, 2006. Claims 1-24 currently stand rejected. Applicants respectfully traverse.

In light of the remarks presented below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all now-pending claims of the present application.

Objection to the Specification

The specification has been objected to for introducing new matter. Specifically, the Office Action states that the recitation “via a packet translation learned during a self configuration”, which Applicants previously added to the specification by the amendment of March 21, 2006 in order to provide clear support for a similar amendment made to independent claims 1, 10 and 17, constitutes new matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation above finds support in a priority document through which a clear chain of priority has been established as set forth in greater detail below.

The present application is a continuation in part of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/458,569 filed on December 8, 1999, titled “Systems And Methods For Redirecting Users Having Transparent Computer Access To A Network Using A Gateway Device Having Redirection Capability”. U.S. Patent Application No. 09/458,569 issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,636,894 and claimed the benefit of the filing date and priority to U.S. Provisional Application Serial No. 60/111,497 filed on December 8, 1998. On October 31, 2005, Applicants filed an amendment to the specification to update the CROSS REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS section to specifically indicate that U.S. Patent Application No. 09/458,569 had issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,636,894 and that it claimed priority to U.S. Provisional Application Serial No. 60/111,497. As such, the present application enjoys the priority of both U.S. Patent No. 6,636,894 (as a result of the direct claim of priority) and U.S. Provisional Application Serial No. 60/111,497 (as a result of the claim of priority in U.S. Patent No. 6,636,894), which were also each incorporated by reference in their entirety into the present application.

Notably, with respect to the recitation “via a packet translation learned during a self

Appl. No.: 09/693,060
Amdt. dated 08/25/2006
Reply to Office action of 05/26/2006

configuration”, U.S. Provisional Application Serial No. 60/111,497 included (as Attachment H) a copy of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/041,534. U.S. Patent Application No. 09/041,534 was filed on March 2, 1998 and ultimately issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,130,892 entitled “Nomadic Translator or Router”. Importantly, U.S. Patent Application No. 09/041,534 and, thus, U.S. Provisional Application Serial No. 60/111,497 provides support for the recitation “via a packet translation learned during a self configuration” as evidenced by col. 11, lines 43-46 of U.S. Patent No. 6,130,892.

In other words, support for the objected to recitation may be found at least in U.S. Patent Application No. 09/041,534, which was included as Attachment H of U.S. Provisional Application Serial No. 60/111,497, to which U.S. Patent No. 6,636,894 claimed priority and all of which are incorporated by reference in their entirety into the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

Independent claims 1, 10 and 17 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the recitation “via a packet translation learned during a self configuration” is alleged to lack support in the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that, for the reasons stated above, the recitation at issue, which has previously been added to the specification by amendment, finds support through the chain of priority described above. Accordingly, since Applicants submit that the recitation above could properly be specifically recited in the specification, the recitation in independent claims 1, 10 and 17 above also finds support in the specification based on the proper amendment to the specification submitted on March 21, 2006.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, are overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-16 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,653, hereinafter "Sitaraman") in view of Taylor (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,730). Claims 17-24 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Taylor and further in view of Bowker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,790, hereinafter "Bowker"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the gateway device enables the source computer to access any network regardless of network configurations via a packet translation function learned during a self configuration. In other words, regardless of a network's configuration, the computer can communicate with the network via the gateway device following a self configuration to learn an appropriate translation function. As will be appreciated, the transparency of access achieved by the claimed invention will be of substantial and welcome assistance to at least those computer users who may travel about and need to log on via different networks since those computer users need no longer manually reconfigure their computers upon attempting to access a different network. Instead, the gateway device of the claimed invention can perform such a reconfiguration on behalf of the computer user.

Sitaraman is directed to a protocol gateway for providing uniform delivery of service. The Office Action admits, and Applicants agree, that Sitaraman neither teaches nor suggests that accessing any network occurs via a packet translation function learned during a self configuration as claimed in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, the Office Action cites Taylor as teaching or suggesting the above recited feature at FIG. 5A, steps 190 to 194 and col. 12, lines 52-60. Taylor is directed to a generic communications protocol translator. As described in the cited passage, Taylor performs an initialization in order to evaluate received messages to determine if incoming messages have known or unknown protocols. However, contrary to the claimed invention which enables access to any network via a packet translation function learned during a self configuration, Taylor discloses that if the incoming message has a protocol that is unknown, the message is rejected and deleted (col. 12, line 66 to col. 13, line 3). Accordingly, even assuming the initialization of Taylor may be considered a self configuration, Taylor still fails to teach or suggest that any

packet translation function is **learned** as recited in independent claim 1. Furthermore, Taylor fails to teach or suggest that such a packet translation function learned during a self configuration is used to enable accessing any network as recited in the claimed invention. Accordingly, Taylor also fails to teach or suggest that the gateway device enables the source computer to access any network regardless of network configurations via a packet translation function learned during a self configuration as recited in independent claim 1.

Bowker is directed to a method of interrupting client requests in a web environment. Bowker also fails to teach or suggest that the gateway device enables the source computer to access any network regardless of network configurations via a packet translation function learned during a self configuration as recited in independent claim 1. Furthermore, Bowker is not cited as disclosing the above recited feature.

Since the cited references each fail to teach or suggest that the gateway device enables the source computer to access any network regardless of network configurations via a packet translation function learned during a self configuration as recited in independent claim 1, any combination of the cited references also fails to teach or suggest the above recited feature. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited references either alone or in combination.

Applicants submit that independent claims 10 and 17 each recite substantially similar subject matter as the method of independent claim 1 with respect to enabling access to any network regardless of network configurations via a packet translation function learned during a self configuration. Thus, independent claims 10 and 17 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claim 1. Claims 2-9, 11-16 and 18-24 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 10 and 17, respectively, and thus include all the recitations of their respective independent claims. Therefore, dependent claims 2-9, 11-16 and 18-24 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for their respective independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1-24 are overcome.

Appl. No.: 09/693,060
Amdt. dated 08/25/2006
Reply to Office action of 05/26/2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad L. Thorson
Registration No. 55,675

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON AUGUST 25, 2006.
LEGAL01/13015440v1